DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 207 HE 024 338

TITLE Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1989-90: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation. Report 90-21.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE Sep 90

NOTE 33p.; For a related document, see HE 024 337.

AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth St., Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Higher Education; Part Time Faculty; Policy Formation; *Salaries; State Aid; State Legislation; *State Universities; Teacher Salaries; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report presents descriptive data on faculty salaries at the California Community Colleges and administrators' salaries at the University of California and the California State University. Part 1 presents an overview of faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges and estimates the mean salary of full-time regular contract faculty at $44,286. It also discusses several policy implications of the community college data and the California Postsecondary Education Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty in community colleges. Part 2 shows the salaries of campus-based and central office administrators at the University of California and the California State University, with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions. It also discusses new Supplemental Budget Language to the 1990-91 Budget Act regarding an expanded review of executive salaries for the University and State University. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary

Pursuant to Supplemental Language to the 1979 and 1981 Budget Acts, the Commission annually prepares reports on faculty salaries at the California Community Colleges and administrators' salaries at the University of California and the California State University. In odd-numbered years, it also prepares reports on medical school faculty salaries at the University of California.

This 1990 report in this series contains the first two of those three elements:

- Part One presents an overview of faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges and estimates the mean salary of full-time regular contract faculty at $44,286. It also discusses several policy implications of the community college data and the Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty in that segment.
- Part Two shows the salaries of campus-based and central office administrators at the University of California and the California State University, with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions. It also discusses new Supplemental Budget Language to the 1990-91 Budget Act regarding an expanded review of executive salaries for the University and State University.

This report is designed to provide only descriptive data and as a consequence offers neither policy conclusions nor recommendations.

The Commission adopted the report at its meeting on September 17, 1990, on the recommendation of its Policy Development Committee. Additional copies may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission at (916) 324-4991. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1989-90

A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 90-21
PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1990

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 90-21 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Executive Summary 1

1. Community College Faculty Salaries 3

- Introduction 3
- Average Salaries 3
- High- and Low-Paying Districts 5
- Cost of Living Adjustments 5
- Salary Schedule Categories 5
- Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time Faculty with Overload Assignments 6
- Summary of the Data 11
- Implications of the Data 12

2. Administrative Salaries at the University and State University 17

- Introduction 17
- University of California 17
- The California State University 19
- New Supplemental Budget Language Regarding Administrator Salaries 20

Appendix Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979 25

References 27

Displays

1. Mean Full-Time Contract Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1989-90 4

2. The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989 6

3. The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989 7

4. Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989 8

5. Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1987-88 to 1989-90 9-10

6. Chaffey Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89 11

7. San Jose/Evergreen Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1988-89 12

8. Marin Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule Effective January 1, 1989 13

9. Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1987 to Fall 1989 14

10. Annualized Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1989-90 18

11. Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Cental-Office Administrators at the University of California, 1989-90 and 1990-91 19

12. Amount and Percent of Salaries Provided by the General Fund and Other Sources to University of California Executives, 1989-90 20

13. Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1989-90 21

14. Actual and Proposed Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the California State University, 1988-89, 1989-90, and 1990-91 22

15. Annualized Year-End Salaries Paid to Central-Office Administrators at the California State University, 1988-89 and 1989-90 22

Executive Summary

THIS REPORT consists of two independent sections:

1. Community college faculty salaries

Part One of the report responds to Supplemental Language to the 1979 Budget Act, which directed the Commission to prepare annual reports on the salaries of California Community College faculty members. It presents an overview of those salaries and estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $44,286. It indicates that the difference in mean salaries between the ten highest-paying and the ten lowest-paying of the 71 districts that reported data to the State is about 25 percent. Finally, it shows that on a statewide basis, full-time faculty salaries are nearly twice as high per weekly faculty contact hour as part-time faculty and about 61 percent more than overload faculty. If fringe benefits are added, this disparity is even greater.

This year's report also includes a discussion of implications of the community college data and the Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty in this segment.

2. Administrators' salaries at the University and State University

Part Two of the report responds to Supplemental Language in the 1981 Budget Act, which instructed the Commission to report annually on the salaries of University of California and California State University administrators. It shows the salaries for campus-based and central-office administrative positions at the University and State University, with comparison-institution data for the campus-based positions.

This part also shows that, for several reasons, campus-based administrative salaries at the University of California lag behind the mean salaries reported by its comparison institutions in 14 of the 18 administrative positions surveyed for the report, with the differences ranging from 0.1 percent for deans of graduate programs to 29.9 percent for deans of business. Chancellors of the University's campuses on the average earn 8.8 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts.

At the State University, campus administrators in six positions received between 0.7 and 27.1 percent more than the mean of their counterparts at comparison institutions, while campus administrators in 11 other positions received between 1.1 and 15.5 percent less. These data should be viewed with caution, however, since only three-fourths of the comparison institutions reported salary information for the majority of these positions. State University campus presidents received 7.9 percent less than their comparison-institution counterparts.

The section regarding the State University also discusses several aberrations in this year's data, which are attributed to the rescission of salary increases this May that had been enacted in January for selected high-level executives.

Finally, the report discusses new Supplemental Budget Language to the 1990-91 Budget Act that calls on the Commission to study in greater detail administrator salaries at the University and State University.

1 *Community College Faculty Salaries*

Introduction

In February 1979, the Legislative Analyst recommended in the Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80, that the Commission include information on California Community College faculty salaries in its annual faculty salary reports. Responding to this recommendation, the Commission presented data on community college faculty salaries for the 1977-78 fiscal year in its April 1979 report, *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80*, but it was unable to include data for 1978-79 (the then current year) because the Chancellor's Office had abandoned such data collection as part of the cutbacks resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978.

Subsequently, Commission staff proposed that the submission of community college faculty salary data be formalized, and beginning with the 1979-80 fiscal year it was. In August 1979, Commission staff outlined for the Chancellor the specific information desired (Appendix, pp. 25-26) and asked the Chancellor's staff to submit 1978-79 data by November 1, 1979, and subsequent fiscal-year data by March 1 of the year involved.

In 1981-82, the Chancellor's Office initiated the "Staff Data File" -- a computerized data collection system that is now in its ninth year of operation and that has provided comprehensive reports for the past eight years. During these years, the Chancellor's Office has produced comprehensive and accurate reports that contain information on average salaries and salary ranges; cost-of-living adjustments; teaching loads; numbers of full- and part-time faculty; age, sex, and ethnicity of its faculty; number of new hires, promotions, and separations; and qualifications and schedules for various salary categories.

Despite this substantial improvement in reporting from prior years, two problems still remain:

- The first relates to incomplete data, due primarily to protracted collective bargaining negotiations. When negotiations extend into the spring of the current academic year, and cost-of-living adjustments are accordingly allocated retroactively, there is seldom sufficient time to include the increases in the mean salary figures reported. The result is that many of the mean salaries reported are inaccurate. In addition, 30 of the system's 71 districts did not report cost-of-living adjustments for this year.
- The second problem is that complete salary adjustments are not always reported. In 1989-90, for example, one-time "off-schedule" adjustments were granted to faculty in four districts. In addition, in its analysis of salaries, the Chancellor's Office averages all increases granted after July 1 over the entire year. Thus, a 5 percent increase granted on January 1 is only counted as a 2.5 percent increase, even though the effect is to lift the entire salary schedule by 5 percent by the end of the fiscal year. These analytical differences in computing average salaries are discussed further in the next section.

Average salaries

Display 1 on page 4 shows 1989-90 mean full-time contract faculty salaries as reported by 70 of the 71 districts, with Lassen Community College District not reporting. The first footnote in that display indicates that nine districts did not report cost-of-living increases for 1989-90 and consequently could not incorporate such increases into their mean salary figures. Consequently, the salaries reported for those districts more nearly approximate 1988-89 salaries. The second footnote includes 30 districts where salary negotiations were complete but which did not have sufficient time to incorporate those increases into their mean salary figures.

In all, Display 1 indicates that accurate current-year data are available for only 40 districts -- 56.3 percent of the 71 possible -- with the faculty employed by those districts representing 51.3 percent of the

DISPLAY 1 Mean Full-Time Contract Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1989-90

District	Mean Salary	District	Mean Salary
Allan Hancock[2]	$40,885	Palo Verde	$39,411
Antelope Valley[2]	40,486	Palomar	46,763
Barstow	42,125	Pasadena Area	43,866
Butte[2]	42,576	Peralta	39,506
Cabrillo[2]	38,560	Rancho Santiago	47,654
Cerritos[1]	47,835	Redwoods	43,187
Chaffey[1]	31,741	Rio Hondo[2]	45,581
Citrus	47,418	Riverside	45,750
Coachella Valley (Desert)[2]	40,717	Saddleback	47,978
Coast	45,827	San Bernardino[1]	41,475
Compton[1]	34,464	San Diego	38,734
Contra Costa[2]	47,193	San Francisco[2]	41,425
El Camino[1]	46,220	San Joaquin Delta[2]	48,243
Feather River[1]	35,968	San Jose[1]	44,799
Foothill/DeAnza	50,499	San Luis Obispo	42,868
Fremont-Newark	46,064	San Mateo[2]	45,449
Gavilan	42,604	Santa Barbara[2]	41,078
Glendale	45,201	Santa Clarita[2]	43,412
Grossmont[2]	42,849	Santa Monica	46,828
Hartnell	42,501	Sequoias	48,020
Imperial[2]	38,312	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	43,264
Kern	43,226	Sierra	43,602
Lake Tahoe	42,003	Siskiyou	38,330
Lassen[3]	N/R	Solano County[2]	43,943
Long Beach	47,287	Sonoma County	46,880
Los Angeles[2]	43,282	South County	46,840
Los Rios[1]	43,362	Southwestern[2]	45,787
Marin	49,246	State Center	44,810
Mendocino	39,490	Ventura County	47,522
Merced[2]	41,917	Victor Valley	38,831
Mira Costa	45,435	West Hills	42,172
Monterey Peninsula[2]	40,308	West Kern	48,291
Mt. San Antonio[2]	45,988	West Valley	46,589
Mt. San Jacinto	41,448	Yosemite[2]	43,171
Napa[1]	40,344	Yuba	45,888
North Orange	46,160	**Systemwide Average**	**44,286**

1. These nine districts were still in the process of salary negotiations for 1989-90 at the time mean salary data were reported. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximate the 1988-89 mean.

2. Although salary negotiations in these 21 districts were complete as of the Chancellor's Office deadline for reporting data, mean salary data do not reflect the 1989-90 cost-of-living adjustment. Consequently, the salaries reported may more closely approximate the 1988-89 mean.

3. Lassen Community College District did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

systemwide total. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual mean salary for the system is higher than the $44,286 reported in the display. To provide an estimate of actual salaries, the mean salaries of the 30 nonreporting districts (excluding Lassen), were incremented by 7.07 percent -- the average percent increase for the 40 reporting districts -- which resulted in a systemwide mean salary of $44,668. There is no way of knowing how accurate that figure may be, but it is probably closer to reality than the $44,286 in Display 1.

High- and low-paying districts

Displays 2 and 3 on pages 6 and 7 show mean salaries as reported in the Staff Data File for regular and contract faculty in the ten highest- and ten lowest-paying districts for selected years between Fall 1987 and Fall 1989, and the systemwide means for each of those years. In each case, those districts reporting incomplete mean salary data are indicated. Display 4 on page 8 shows mean salaries for those districts as a group, the percentage difference between them, and their total number of faculty.

In 1989-90, the highest-paying district was Foothill/DeAnza with a mean of $50,499. The lowest-paying was Chaffey with a mean of $31,742 -- although it should be noted that Chaffey's faculty were still in negotiations with respect to their existing contract with their district administration. Among those districts that had finalized negotiations, the lowest paying was Siskiyou at $38,330 -- a figure 24.1 percent lower than Foothill/DeAnza.

From Display 2 it can be seen that those districts with higher salaries tend to be the larger districts and also tend to be those reporting complete data. These higher salaries actually become more pronounced if the evening programs at San Diego and San Francisco are included in the overall districtwide average.

Faculty working in these evening programs tend to be paid about one-fourth less than regular faculty at the main campus, and their inclusion consequently reduces the districtwide average. Were they to be included, the differences between the highest- and lowest-paying districts, as shown in Display 4, would be even greater, thus highlighting the size factor even more. Either way, the difference in mean salaries between the highest-paying district (Foothill/DeAnza) and the lowest-paying district (Chaffey) is about 59.1 percent. Taken as groups of the ten highest and ten lowest, the difference is 29.6 percent, but considering that six of the ten lowest-paying but only two of the ten highest-paying districts reported incomplete data, the true difference between these two groups is probably closer to 25 percent.

Cost of living adjustments

Display 5 on pages 9 and 10 provides cost-of-living-adjustment data, by district, for the current and previous two years, weighted by the size of faculty in each district. In each case, off-schedule payments and mid-year adjustments increase the systemwide average from that reported by the Chancellor's Office for 1987-88 from 4.00 to 5.02 percent, for 1988-89 from 4.77 to 5.73 percent, and for 1989-90 from 6.26 to 7.07 percent.

Salary schedule categories

The salary schedules of the 71 districts generally provide a number of salary categories or classes through which faculty members can advance depending on educational qualifications, and another series of steps that provide salary increases based on longevity. Typical schedules are reproduced as Displays 6, 7, and 8 on pages 11, 12, and 13 and show the marked differences that exist between low-, medium-, and high-paying districts.

As with mean salaries, these schedules vary greatly from district to district, with some districts offering only one salary classification based on educational achievement, while others offer as many as nine. In addition, some districts have as few as 12 anniversary increments, while others have 30 or more. In some cases, additional stipends are provided to doctoral degree holders, department chairmen, and others with special qualifications or responsibilities.

DISPLAY 2 The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989

	Ten Highest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1983	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989[3]
Number of Districts:	70	70	69	68	68	69
Foothill/DeAnza		$41,547	$41,711	$43,466	$45,363	$50,499
Marin				45,013	46,753	49,246
West Kern	$36,786	38,975	41,934	44,201	45,916	48,291
San Joaquin Delta[1]	35,579	41,562	44,029	45,923	46,311	48,243
Sequoias	38,750				45,074	48,020
Saddleback	37,697	42,083	41,815	46,335	48,413	47,978
Cerritos[1]	34,900	39,258	41,746	44,097	46,009	47,835
Rancho Santiago						47,654
Ventura						47,522
Citrus						47,418
Contra Costa		39,047	43,998	43,979	47,661	
San Mateo					45,323	
Rio Hondo			40,481	43,602	45,299	
Southwestern				42,764		48,020
Mt. San Antonio	34,942	38,417	40,632	42,685		
Long Beach	34,754	39,547	42,326			
Santa Monica		39,809	41,334			
San Jose	35,053					
Coast	35,015					
Desert		39,211				
El Camino	37,110					
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**	**$42,035**	**$44,286**

1. Annualized 1989-90 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.

2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.

3. Includes both credit and non-credit instructional faculty.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments

For many years, the community colleges have employed a large number of part-time or temporary faculty, and most districts have also permitted full-time regular and contract faculty to work additional hours or overloads. Display 9 on page 14 shows several comparisons between full-time, part-time, and overload faculty between Fall 1987 and Fall 1989. For example, it shows the number of full-time faculty with and without overload assignments compared to the number of part-time faculty. It also shows workload in terms of weekly faculty contact hours (WFCH) -- the actual number of hours faculty spend in classrooms. Comparing these two, it can be seen that, while the number of part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty by more than two-to-

DISPLAY 3 The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989

	Ten Lowest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1983	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989[3]
Number of Districts:	70	70	69	68	69	69
Chaffey[1]						$31,742
Compton[1]	$29,091	$30,632	$30,929	$34,475	$35,268	34,464
Feather River[1]						35,968
Imperial[1]		30,900	32,090	32,642	35,233	38,312
Siskiyou	28,326			34,843	36,524	38,330
Cabrillo[1]	28,631	32,264	32,960	33,768	35,286	38,560
San Diego						38,734
Victor Valley[1]		31,967	34,061			38,831
Palo Verde		30,930		34,505	35,731	39,411
Mendocino				36,460	36,791	39,490
Napa	28,245	31,442	33,099	33,581	35,453	
Peralta	29,213			36,275	37,432	
Mount San Jacinto					37,699	
Lake Tahoe	28,429				38,125	
West Hills				36,346		
Lassen	29,098	32,308	32,856			
Allan Hancock	28,401		33,962			
Monterey Peninsula			34,385			
Santa Barbara			34,794			
Gavilan		32,234				
Antelope Valley	29,185	32,341				
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**	**$42,035**	**$44,286**

1. Annualized 1989-90 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.
3. Includes both credit and non-credit instructional faculty.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

one, they teach only 37.6 percent of these contact hours. Regular and contract faculty teach 55.8 percent on regular assignments, with those teaching overloads accounting for the remaining 6.6 percent. Regular and contract faculty on regular assignments averaged 16.3 weekly faculty contact hours in 1989-90, while part-time faculty averaged 5.6 hours, and those teaching any overload averaged 4.9 additional hours. About 40.8 percent of full-time regular and contract faculty members teach some overload. All of these averages have been relatively constant for the three-year period shown in Display 9.

Compensation comparisons between full-time and part-time faculty are difficult, since full-time faculty have responsibilities other than classroom teaching, while part-time faculty generally do not. Full-time faculty spend time in counseling, advising,

DISPLAY 4 Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1983 to Fall 1989

Item	Fall 1983	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987	Fall 1988	Fall 1989
Mean Salaries:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$35,748	$40,059	$42,144	$44,137	$46,304	$48,503
Unweighted	36,059	39,946	42,001	44,207	46,212	48,271
Ten Lowest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$28,563	$31,547	$32,515	$34,454	$36,399	$37,411
Unweighted	28,645	31,619	32,422	34,600	36,354	37,384
Percent by Which the Ten Highest Paying Districts Exceed the Ten Lowest Paying Districts (Weighted Means):	25.2%	27.0%	29.6%	28.1%	27.2%	29.6%
Systemwide Mean Salary (69 Districts)[1]	$32,704	$36,203	$38,005	$40,046	$42,035	$44,268
Number of Regular Faculty:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts	2,572	2,044	2,182	2,022	2,121	2,012
Ten Lowest Paying Districts	1,891	974	1,341	1,205	833	1,083
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Total Faculty)	36.0%	109.9%	62.7%	67.8%	154.6%	85.8%

1. Weighted by total full-time faculty in each reporting district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

committee work, office hours, and community service. Preparation for classroom teaching, however, necessarily occupies a considerable amount of time for both full-time and part-time faculty. The exact proportion of total workload devoted to activities not directly related to classroom teaching is not known, but an assumption used recently by the Chancellor's Office (1987, p. 7) is that three-fourths is instructionally related (teaching and preparation) with the remaining one-fourth devoted to other campus activities. With this factor, although not a precise measure, it is possible to present a general comparison.

The Chancellor's Office publishes hourly rates for part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments, and these systemwide data are shown in Item 5 in Display 9, which indicates that overload faculty are currently paid about 18 percent more than part-time faculty.

Items 7 and 8 in Display 9 compare the estimate of compensation per weekly faculty contact hour for full-time faculty with the actual data reported for part-time and overload faculty. Also on a systemwide basis, these comparisons show full-time faculty in 1989-90 earning nearly twice as much (90.6 percent) per weekly faculty contact hour in salary as part-time faculty, and 61.4 percent more than the amount paid for overload assignments. If fringe

DISPLAY 5 Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1987-88 to 1989-90

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1989-90	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-9	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1989-90
Allan Hancock	97	5.00%	4.07%	6.40%
Antelope Valley	88	5.10	5.12	5.50
Barstow	23	0.00	0.00	6.00
Butte	121	6.65	5.23	6.37
Cabrillo	154	4.00	5.25	8.00
Cerritos	214	5.20	5.70	*
Chaffey	154	6.00	8.50	*
Citrus	105	4.50	4.00	6.37
Coachella	101	5.50	6.50	10.00
Coast	554	2.00	7.01	3.00
Compton	66	7.00	7.00	*
Contra Costa	384	4.00	4.70	7.00
El Camino	289	5.00	5.35	*
Feather River	16	*	*	*
Foothill	438	5.00	5.00	7.00
Fremont-Newark	99	4.00	4.70	7.00
Gavilan	51	5.25	5.00	8.00
Glendale	174	3.00	8.00	5.64
Grossmont	214	6.50	6.00	14.00
Hartnell	80	1.80	4.00	5.00
Imperial	71	9.00	9.00	10.00
Kern	255	3.42	5.00	4.00
Lake Tahoe	17	7.00	5.80	3.00
Lassen	N/R	3.40	5.00	N/R
Long Beach	254	4.00	4.35	5.20
Los Angeles	1,586	7.00	6.00	8.00
Los Rios	563	9.58	9.30	*
Marin	136	3.50	6.10	0.00
Mendocino	40	2.95	6.00	7.46
Merced	93	6.00	6.20	5.00
MiraCosta	73	4.00	4.91	11.50
Monterey Peninsula	96	5.00	6.50	9.00
Mt. San Antonio	256	4.25	5.00	5.00
Mt. San Jacinto	42	6.26	5.25	4.64
Napa	79	2.38	9.50	*
North Orange	429	6.00	1.00	7.50
Palo Verde	13	4.50	6.00	6.00
Palomar	223	5.00	7.32	9.00
Pasadena Area	284	6.00	6.12	7.00
Peralta	292	0.00	3.00	6.00

(continued)

DISPLAY 5, continued

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1989-90	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-89	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1989-90
Rancho Santiago	259	4.28%	2.40%	7.20%
Redwoods	91	4.80	4.93	5.21
Rio Hondo	163	3.40	4.72	8.00
Riverside	180	4.00	6.00	8.00
Saddleback	250	4.64	6.70	6.14
San Bernardino	178	3.40	*	*
San Diego	464	8.00	7.00	12.40
San Francisco	592	0.00	7.00	7.00
San Joaquin Delta	210	5.50	4.90	5.10
San Jose	184	4.75	4.75	*
San Luis Obispo	82	6.58	6.88	6.00
San Mateo	345	5.00	6.00	7.50
Santa Barbara	155	3.40	5.74	8.00
Santa Clarita	52	5.00	6.70	6.00
Santa Monica	218	6.00	6.00	7.00
Sequoias	130	5.20	5.30	5.50
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	102	3.00	3.50	8.00
Sierra	119	4.00	4.00	6.00
Siskiyou	44	0.00	5.00	3.67
Solano County	120	3.00	8.00	8.00
Sonoma County	213	5.25	6.00	6.01
South County	214	4.00	6.30	6.00
Southwestern	160	7.00	5.00	6.00
State Center	280	5.00	6.75	6.39
Ventura County	251	6.00	7.00	8.00
Victor Valley	61	5.00	5.00	9.30
West Hills	45	5.20	5.30	5.50
West Kern	19	2.10	5.00	5.00
West Valley	244	6.00	5.05	9.00
Yosemite	205	3.40	4.80	7.00
Yuba	109	6.00	5.75	5.75
Number of Districts Reporting	70	69	69	61
Total/Mean -- Based on Reporting Districts	13,963	5.02%	5.73%	7.07%

1. Lassen Community College District did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

* These nine districts were still in salary negotiations at the Chancellor's Office deadline for submitting data.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

DISPLAY 6 Chaffey Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89

Step	Effective 7/1/87	Effective 4/1/88	Effective 1/1/89	Effective 1/1/90
1	$18,672	$19,792	$20,782	$21,613
2	19,580	20,755	21,793	22,664
3	20,488	21,718	22,804	23,716
4	21,397	22,681	23,815	24,767
5	22,305	23,643	24,826	25,819
6	23,214	24,606	25,837	26,870
7	24,122	25,569	26,848	27,922
8	25,030	26,532	27,859	28,973
9	27,016	28,637	30,069	31,272
10	27,925	29,600	31,080	32,323
11	28,833	30,563	32,091	33,375
12	29,741	31,526	33,102	34,426
M.A.	$891	$944	$991	$1,031
Ph.D.	2,253	2,388	2,508	2,608

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

benefits are added, these percentages would be even higher.

Summary of the data

In the current year, regular and contract faculty for which complete data exist earned an average salary of $44,286 -- an amount that is probably understated by 2 to 3 percent, since only 40 districts submitted complete data in time for inclusion in the Chancellor's Office report. Thirty other districts reported the percentage amount of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) but could not include the increase in their mean salary figures. Of these 30, nine districts were still in the process of negotiating current-year increases and thus could not report a cost-of-living adjustment figure. Two additional districts -- Barstow and Marin -- reported 0.0 percent cost-of-living changes, although Barstow provided a one-time 6 percent cost-of-living adjustment in June 1990. The remaining district -- Lassen -- reported no information. Most of the nine districts reporting no cost-of-living adjustment, primarily because of protracted collective bargaining decisions, are likely to approve some increase in salary for their faculty.

For the 61 districts that did report cost-of-living adjustment data, the average increase for 1989-90 was 7.07 percent, once off-schedule adjustments are included. This compares to a comparable figure of about 5.73 percent in 1988-89. Part-time faculty continue to be paid about half the amount paid to full-time faculty on a per-contact-hour basis, and the difference between them has increased slightly over the past three years. The number of part-time faculty employed has increased by 14.2 percent since 1987 -- from 25,056 to 28,606. The relative share of contact hours taught by full-time faculty has declined slightly, while the share taught by part-time faculty and full-time faculty teaching overloads has increased slightly over the three-year period surveyed in this report.

The lack of complete mean salary data continues to be a problem with the Chancellor's Office Staff Data File, one that is probably unsolvable given the length of many collective bargaining negotiations and the early spring deadline for the Chancellor's

DISPLAY 7 San Jose/Evergreen Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1988-89

Step	Class I BA	Class II MA	Class III BA +45 Units with MA	Class IV BA +60 Units with MA	Class V BA +81 Units with MA	Class VI Doctorate
		Temporary Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area Plus 25 Units	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area Plus 50 Units with BA	Doctorate
1	22,756	25,428	26,637	27,851	29,060	29,824
2	23,706	26,536	27,783	29,100	30,435	31,200
3	24,651	27,647	28,921	30,345	31,802	32,568
4	25,597	28,752	30,066	31,596	33,175	33,941
5	26,543	29,858	31,202	32,845	34,546	35,313
6	27,483	30,967	32,343	34,093	35,919	36,682
7	28,568	32,072	33,486	35,344	37,291	38,057
8	29,514	33,180	34,624	36,592	38,663	39,430
9[2]	30,460	34,286	35,767	37,841	40,032	40,798
10	31,406	35,394	36,911	39,090	41,405	42,171
11	32,351	36,503	38,048	40,340	42,772	43,539
12	32,351	37,608	39,191	41,589	44,147	44,911
13	32,351	38,714	40,331	42,834	45,518	46,284
14	32,351	38,714	40,331	42,834	45,518	46,284
15	32,351	38,714	40,331	42,834	45,518	46,284
16	32,351	39,681	41,339	43,906	46,657	47,440
19[3]				44,975	47,792	48,598
22[3]					48,931	49,754

1. Vocation fields specified by the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District.
2. Maximun beginning step placement for years of experience.
3. Requires Professional Recognition plan approved by Professional Recognition Committee, longevity, and completion of nine semester units.

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

Office report. For this reason, the data appearing in this part of the report should be viewed with caution.

Implications of the data

A major challenge facing the California Community Colleges through the year 2000 will be the recruitment of a large number of new faculty. Current Chancellor's Office estimates suggest that some 18,000 new hires will be needed during the next 15 years in response to anticipated enrollment growth and to replace those who will leave the system through retirement or normal attrition (at present, the average age of full-time community college faculty members is about 49 years). The number of part-time faculty members, and their proper role in community college staffing, will also present a key issue regarding faculty quality during this time.

DISPLAY 8 Marin Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule Effective January 1, 1989

Step	I	II	III	IV	V
1	26,155	27,997	29,481	31,634	32,332
2	27,420	29,341	30,827	33,009	33,719
3	28,686	30,686	32,173	34,383	35,106
4	29,951	32,030	33,519	35,758	36,492
5	31,217	33,375	34,865	37,133	37,879
6	32,482	34,719	36,211	38,508	39,266
7	33,748	36,064	37,557	39,882	40,653
8	35,013	37,408	38,903	41,257	42,040
9	36,279	38,753	40,249	42,632	43,426
10	37,544	40,097	41,595	44,006	44,813
11	38,810	41,441	42,941	45,381	46,200
12	40,075	42,786	44,287	46,756	47,587
13	41,341	44,130	45,633	48,130	48,974
14	42,606	45,475	46,980	49,505	50,361
15	43,872	46,819	48,326	50,880	51,747
16	45,137	48,164	49,672	52,255	53,134

Column I - Bachelor's degree or partial fulfillment of a Life Instructor's Credential in a vocational-related discipline.

Column II - Master's degree or clear Life Instructor's Credential in a vocational-related discipline with a Bachelor's degree.

Column II - Master's degree plus 30 semester hours subsequent to the date of the Master's degree, or Bachelor's degree plus 60 semester hours with Master's degree, or clear Life Instructor's Credential in a vocational-related discipline with a Bachelor's degree and 60 semester hours subsequent to the date of the clear Life Instructor's Credential in a vocational-related discipline.

Column IV - Master's degree plus 60 semester hours subsequent to the date of the Master's degree or Bachelor's degree plus 90 semester hours with Master's degree.

Column V - Earned Doctorate.

Notes:

1. Step 7 is the highest entering step for permanent teachers new to the District. Step 3 is the highest entering step for temporary credit unit members.
2. A $1,000 bonus is paid once for receiving earned Doctorate from an accredited institution while employed by the District. Any regular contract employee receiving such an award must agree to remain under contract to the District for two years after the award is granted, such guarantee to be enforced by a surety bond.
3. Temporary credit instructors may not advance beyond Step 10. All temporary credit instructors employed prior to Fall 1987 and are at Step 10 or above will be retained at the step they held on 5/29/87 but will not advance further. All other temporary credit instructors may advance to Step 10.

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

The data on community college faculty compensation presented in this section of the report reveal several conditions with major implications for the future:

The salary disparity between districts may have adverse implications for current and future quality. These differences, like many others related to local control in a statewide financing system, create tensions that the current funding system appears unable to address.

The use of part-time faculty is a second issue of concern. The number of these faculty has increased by

DISPLAY 9 ***Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1987 to Fall 1989***

Item		Fall 1987	Fall 1988	Fall 1989
1. Number of Faculty Members:				
	Full-Time Faculty[1]	8,132	8,124	8,260
	Part-Time Faculty	25,056	26,031	28,606
	Overload Faculty	5,349	5,490	5,703
2. Total WFCH Taught:				
	Full-Time Faculty	230,330	229,829	234,249
	Part-Time Faculty	133,459	139,484	158,016
	Overload Faculty	24,951	25,877	27,843
3. Percentage Distribution of WFCH Taught:				
	Full-Time Faculty	59.3%	58.2%	55.8%
	Part-Time Faculty	34.3	35.3	37.6
	Overload Faculty	6.4	6.5	6.6
4. Mean WFCH Taught:	Full-Time Faculty[2]	17.1	16.9	16.3
	Part-Time Faculty	5.3	5.4	5.6
	Overload Faculty	4.7	4.7	4.9
5. Mean Dollars Paid per WFCH:				
	Part-Time Faculty	$26.77	$28.38	$29.68
	Overload Faculty	31.36	33.22	35.04
6. Compensation of Overload Faculty as a Percentage of Part-Time Faculty:		117.1%	117.1%	118.1%
7. Mean Dollars Paid to Contract and Regular Faculty per WFCH, Assuming No Overload Assignments:[3]				
	Unadjusted	$66.97	$71.14	$75.42
	Adjusted[4]	50.23	53.36	56.57
8. Compensation of Full-Time Faculty (Adjusted in Item 7) as a Percentage of Part-Time and Overload Faculty per WFCH:				
	Part-Time Faculty	187.6%	188.0%	190.6%
	Overload Faculty	160.2	160.6	161.4

1. No overload.
2. Full-time faculty teaching regular assignments only.
3. Based on a 35-week year.
4. Dollar amount reduced by 25 percent to reflect additional responsibilities of regular and contract faculty such as counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

over 14 percent in the last three years alone, and they continue to represent a major part of campus teaching loads. This increase may be inconsistent with the provisions of AB 1725, as noted below.

Uses of part-time faculty and AB 1725

Colleges make temporary faculty appointments for a variety of reasons: to fill definable needs within a department, such as the replacement of regular faculty who have other assignments either on or off campus; to replace retired faculty; to fill full-time positions because of the lack of qualified applicants; to perform specialized functions such as teach remedial or basic courses; to fill positions when tenured or tenure-tract faculty are not available; and to meet the need for special or unique expertise. In addition, today's community college students are older, more frequently part-time, and often employed full-time. Many institutions have responded to these students by developing extensive evening class schedules and hiring part-time faculty to teach them.

There is general agreement that the community colleges need temporary faculty in order to respond to these staffing challenges and to provide certain courses that require special expertise. Yet the college administrators may have become increasingly dependent upon the use of part-time faculty not only to meet the special needs of students but also as a means of balancing their budgets.

In 1988, the Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988), part of which requires the community colleges to address by 1992 "a long-standing policy of the Board of Governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California Community Colleges as a system should be taught by full-time instructors." In the past, part-time appointments may have been justified by budget limitations. The well-known "freeway flyer" -- the part-time faculty person who often commutes dozens of miles between campuses or even districts -- receives no fringe benefits and is compensated with only about half the salary of full-time faculty members.

However, the overuse of part-time faculty may be detrimental to the quality of community college instruction, and thus this use may not be desirable. Some faculty who will retire in the coming years will undoubtedly be replaced by part-time faculty because of deficiencies in the pool of qualified full-time faculty or to save on costs. The result may be a reduction of tenured faculty that in turn will have a consequent impact on the curricular responsibilities of the remaining tenured faculty, since part-time faculty are not normally required to carry out those responsibilities.

The Commission has determined that the implications of part-time faculty compensation and the adequacy of current State policies regarding the use of part-time faculty at the community colleges warrant further study. For this reason, the Commission has embarked on an examination of part-time faculty at each of the State's three public systems of higher education -- the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges.

In the context of analyzing California's needs to expand its higher education systems through the year 2005, the Commission will be studying the need for a new and culturally diverse faculty that will be necessary to meet anticipated enrollment growth and to replace existing faculty who will be retiring during this decade. One facet of this review of faculty resources will be a study on the use of part-time faculty. Because of limited information on the use of part-time faculty by California's public colleges and universities, the Commission has made it a priority to prepare a data base as a preliminary step in examining this issue.

Special implications for community college data

As noted above, the number of part-time faculty employed by the California Community Colleges has increased markedly in recent years -- up over 14 percent since 1987 alone -- and their relative share of contact hours has increased slightly, while the share taught by full-time faculty has declined slightly. As California's community college districts enter the 1990s, they must gear up to attract many more faculty members while attempting to limit the proportion of the teaching load assigned to part-time faculty. Meeting this legislative directive, while assuring a competent and complete faculty workforce, may be difficult for many community college districts that employ large numbers of part-time faculty.

2 *Administrative Salaries at the University and State University*

Introduction

During the 1981 Legislative Session, the Budget Conference Committee of the Legislature adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission include in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits comparative information on salaries of administrators within the University of California and the California State University.

Since 1981-82, the University and the State University have collected data from their comparison institutions and forwarded them to the Commission for analysis. The Commission has then included them in its reports, together with additional data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). In this way, it has become possible to present a comparison between California's public institutions and those in the rest of the nation for a representative sample of administrative positions.

For several years, consensus was lacking about which positions should be surveyed, which comparisons were valid, and which comparison institutions would provide the most useful data. Initially in 1981-82, a list of 25 administrative titles was selected from the list of 130 position descriptions developed by CUPA, and this number was reduced to as few as 15 in 1983-84. In 1986, the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology discussed the issue of administrators' salaries and compiled a list that should remain constant for the foreseeable future and that includes 18 campus-based positions at both the University of California and the California State University, plus 12 and 10 positions from the respective central offices. It also agreed that the same group of comparison institutions used for faculty analyses should be used for administrators, but only for the campus-based positions rather than central office positions.

University of California

Campus-based positions

Display 10 on page 18 shows the data submitted by the University of California and its comparison institutions for campus-based positions in 1989-90. As it indicates, the University's administrative salaries trailed comparison-group salaries in all but four position categories -- director of personnel, chief of physical plant, director of campus security, and dean of agriculture. Several factors account for the University lags:

- First, University administrators received an approximate average 6 percent merit increase effective January 1, 1990 -- reflecting only a six-month salary increase for the 1989-90 fiscal year. (Salary increases for chancellors ranged from 7.5 to 8.0 percent during the 1989-90 fiscal year.) If these merit increases had taken effect on July 1, 1989, University salaries would appear more competitive.
- Second, the University's lag in several position categories may stem from the fact that comparison institutions may not have reported data for all comparative positions. If only high-paying campuses report data on a particular position, the average salary reported may be skewed. In addition, Yale University did not participate in this year's survey.
- Third, the University has in recent years added staff in various position categories. For example, in 1987-88, the University added three directors of athletics, which had the net effect of lowering the average for this position in that

DISPLAY 10 Annual Year-End Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1989-90

Administrative Title	University of California Average	Comparison Institution Average	University Exceeds or (Lags) Comparison Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution	$155,589	$169,324	(8.83%)
Chief Academic Officer	129,433	146,152	(12.92)
Chief Business Officer	115,925	130,318	(12.42)
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	90,375	87,186	3.53
Chief Budgeting Officer	86,956	98,116	(12.83)
Director, Library Services	96,571	107,232	(11.04)
Director, Computer Center	85,875	99,484	(15.85)
Chief, Physical Plant	90,247	89,114	1.26
Director, Campus Security	70,529	69,991	0.76
Director, Information Systems	87,940	91,970	(4.58)
Director, Student Financial Aid	67,416	70,291	(4.26)
Director, Athletics	97,582	106,844	(9.49)
Dean of Agriculture	112,033	112,000	0.03
Dean of Arts and Sciences	103,483	124,993	(20.79)
Dean of Business	117,140	152,117	(29.86)
Dean of Education	105,750	110,978	(4.94)
Dean of Engineering	121,300	147,029	(21.21)
Dean of Graduate Programs	105,950	106,101	(0.14)

Note: Comparison institutions include Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Stanford University, the State University of New York (Buffalo), the University of Illinois (Urbana), the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), and the University of Virginia. Yale University did not respond to this year's survey.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

year. The addition or deletion of staff can adversely affect the average salaries reported.

Despite these caveats, Display 10 shows that four University of California campus-based administrative titles are paid between 0.03 and 3.53 percent more than their comparison-institution counterparts, while the remaining 14 categories are paid between 0.14 and 29.86 percent less. On the average, chancellors at the University are paid 8.83 percent less than their comparison-institution counterparts, although their annualized salaries became more competitive on January 1, 1990.

Central office positions

Display 11 on the opposite page shows the University's systemwide annual year-end salaries for 1989-90 and those effective July 1, 1990 for its central office or systemwide administrators. (Annualized data for 1990-91 will not be available until after the September Board of Regents meeting.) As displayed, salaries for high-level executives at the University increased by between 5.1 percent for associate vice-presidents and 16.3 percent for vice presidents over the 1988-89 fiscal year. The president of the University of California received a 7.5 percent increase in 1989-90 over the previous year.

DISPLAY 11 Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California, 1989-90 and 1990-91

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries, 1989-90	Range of Increase Over 1988-89	Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries, 1990-91	Range of Increase Over 1989-90
President (1)	$230,600	7.5%	$243,500	5.6%
Senior Vice Presidents (2)	160,900	15.5	170,000	5.7
Vice Presidents (3)	140,900[1] to 145,200[1]	16.3[2]	148,800 to 155,000	6.0[2]
Associate Vice Presidents (4)	116,600[1] to 126,300[1]	5.1[2]	124,800 to 137,700	7.1[2]
Assistant Vice-Presidents (10)	89,800[1] to 118,100[1]	7.1[2]	95,600 to 127,500	6.9[2]
University Controller (1)	106,600	5.0	113,500	6.5
Director of State Governmental Relations (1)	106,300	9.0	114,000	7.2
University Auditor (1)	91,700	6.0	97,700	6.5
General Counsel (1)	161,300	12.9	170,500	5.4
Treasurer (1)	176,600	7.5	200,400	13.5
Associate Treasurer (1)	145,200	6.5	162,900	12.2
Secretary to the Regents (1)	105,000	6.5	110,800	5.5

1. Annual year-end salary rates as of June 30, 1990.

2. Average percent increase over the previous year.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

Display 12 on page 20 shows that significant proportions of salaries paid to the University's central office executives are funded from sources other than the State's General Fund. Specifically, in 1989-90, the president of the University received $156,808 of his $230,600 salary (68 percent) from the General Fund and $73,792 (32 percent) from other revenue sources such as Regents' special funds. Similarly, senior vice-presidents received from 10 to 25 percent of their salaries from sources other than the General Fund, while vice-presidents received 5 to 35 percent from these non-State sources.

The California State University

The California State University surveyed 17 campus-based positions, as shown in Display 13 on page 21, and nine central-office positions, as shown in Displays 14 and 15 on pages 22 and 23. For the campus-based positions, only between 11 and 14 comparison institutions reported data for most position titles; therefore, the analysis that follows should be viewed with caution.

Campus-based positions

During 1989-90, the State University paid between 0.7 and 27.1 percent more for six position titles, and between 1.1 and 15.5 percent less for 11 position titles, than its reporting comparison institutions. It has consistently paid substantially more than its comparison universities to its directors of campus security, its directors of institutional research, and its directors of student financial aid -- and consistently less to all of its deans. Among deans, the

DISPLAY 12 Amount and Percent of Salaries Provided by the General Fund and Other Sources to University of California Executives, 1989-90

Administrative Title	Total Salary	General Fund	Other Sources
President	$230,600	$156,808 (68%)	$73,792 (32%)
Senior Vice President, Administration	160,900	120,675 (75%)	40,225 (25%)
Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs	160,900	144,810 (90%)	16,090 (10%)
Vice President, Budget/University Relations	145,200	130,680 (90%)	14,520 (10%)
Vice President, Health Affairs	145,100	94,315 (65%)	50,785 (35%)
Vice President, Agriculture	140,900	133,855 (95%)	7,045 (5%)

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

greatest divergence is for deans of business (15.5 percent below the comparison group), and the least is for deans of graduate programs (5.3 percent less). The State University's campus presidents currently receive 7.9 percent less on the average than their comparison-institution counterparts.

Central office positions

This year's report on central office executive salaries is unique in that the Trustees authorized 1989-90 salary increases of approximately 43 percent for the chancellor, 33 percent for the executive vice chancellor, and 32 percent for four vice-chancellors and the general counsel over the actual salaries paid in 1988-89. These salary increases were provided on January 1, 1990, only to be rescinded by the Trustees on May 1, 1990 and rolled back to approximately 4.2 percent above previous year-end salaries.

Display 14 on page 22 shows the actual salaries paid to system executives in both 1988-89 and 1989-90 and the proposed salary level for 1990-91. In 1989-90, the chancellor earned $156,781 -- a 21.4 percent increase over the 1988-89 fiscal year. The proposed 1990-91 salary level for the chancellor is $141,942 -- approximately $15,000 less than the actual salary paid in 1989-90. The executive vice chancellor earned $130,145 in 1989-90, or 15.4 percent more than in 1988-89. The proposed 1990-91 salary for this position is $123,948 -- approximately $6,200 less than in 1989-90. Finally, salaries for four vice chancellors and the general counsel in 1989-90 were $127,346, or 15.7 percent higher than those paid in 1988-89. (The general counsel's salary increased by 14.5 percent, in that his salary was slightly higher in 1988-89 than the vice chancellors.) Salaries for these executives are proposed at $122,196 for 1990-91 -- $5,150 less than in 1989-90.

Salaries of other administrators in the central office, including the deputy vice chancellor, nine assistant vice chancellors, and the associate general counsel increased from between 8.7 and 10.5 percent between 1988-89 and 1989-90. Proposed salaries for these positions are not affected by the rescission of salaries paid to the higher level executives.

Display 15 on page 22 lists annualized year-end salaries for 1988-89 and the adjusted year-end salaries for 1989-90 for the same executive positions shown in Display 14. It shows that for the three highest level positions, year-end salaries increased by 4.2 percent, while other administrators' salaries increased between 6.0 and 8.3 percent.

New supplemental budget language regarding administrator salaries

Currently, no systematic methodology exists for establishing executive compensation at either the California State University or the University of California. Because of legislative concern regarding the setting of salaries for State University administra-

DISPLAY 13 Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1989-90

Administrative Title	Number of California State University Campuses	California State University Average	Number of Comparison Institutions	Comparison Institution Average	State University Exceeds or (Lags) Comparison Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution (President)	20	$110,826	14	$120,342	(7.9%)
Chief Academic Officer	17	94,925	17	98,050	(3.2)
Chief Business Officer	19	91,408	11	92,397	(1.1)
Chief Budgeting Officer	17	54,937	11	57,207	(4.0)
Director, Personnel/ Human Resources	16	62,608	17	62,148	0.7
Director of Libraries	18	74,395	16	70,445	5.6
Director of Computer Center	19	71,496	13	75,704	(5.6)
Director of Physical Plant	13	64,646	14	64,083	0.9
Director of Campus Security	18	60,106	13	47,278	27.1
Director of Institutional Research	14	65,992	13	58,092	13.6
Director of Student Financial Aid	19	60,263	16	50,507	19.3
Director, Athletics	18	70,659	13	72,001	(1.9)
Dean of Arts and Sciences	18	79,887	11	88,908	(10.1)
Dean of Business	17	80,831	11	95,618	(15.5)
Dean of Education	19	77,386	11	78,707	(1.7)
Dean of Engineering	11	86,730	13	93,699	(7.4)
Dean of Graduate Programs	7	78,015	12	82,415	(5.3)

Note: Comparison institutions include Arizona State University, University of Bridgeport, Bucknell University, Cleveland State University, University of Colorado (Denver), Georgia State University, Loyola University, Mankato State University, University of Maryland (Baltimore), University of Nevada (Reno), North Carolina State University, Reed College, Rutgers University (Newark), State University of New York (Albany), University of Southern California, University of Texas (Arlington), Tufts University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Wayne State University, and University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

tors, the Legislature adopted Supplemental Budget Language to the 1990-91 Budget Act requesting information regarding the "total compensation" (salary, fringe benefits, and perquisites) paid to campus and systemwide executives at institutions and systemwide offices comparable to the University and State University, in order to better understand the compensation levels and how they are determined in other states:

1. *Top-Level Administrator Salary Comparisons*

   It is the intent of the Legislature that CPEC include in its annual report to the Legislature on administrator salaries information about the total compensation paid to UC and CSU top-level administrators (President/ Chancellor, Senior Vice Presidents, Vice

DISPLAY 14 *Actual and Proposed Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the California State University, 1988-89, 1989-90, and 1990-91*

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	Actual Salaries, 1988-89	Actual Salaries, 1989-90	Range of Increase Over 1988-89	Proposed Salaries, 1990-91
Chancellor (1)	$129,175	$156,781	21.4%	$141,942
Executive Vice Chancellor (1)	112,799	130,145	15.4	123,948
Vice Chancellors (4)	110,060	127,346	15.7	122,196
General Counsel (1)	111,209	127,346	14.5	122,196
Deputy Vice Chancellor (1)	89,210	98,574	10.5	101,448
Assistant Vice Chancellors (9)	82,559	91,015	10.2	94,300
Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	94,909	Vacant	N/A	Vacant
University Auditor (1)	N/A	80,208	N/A	83,412
Associate General Counsel (1)	86,477	94,014	8.7	96,744

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

DISPLAY 15 *Annualized Year-End Salaries Paid to Central-Office Administrators at the California State University, 1988-89 and 1989-90*

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	Annualized Year-End Salaries, 1988-89	Adjusted Year-End Salaries, 1989-90	Range of Increase Over 1988-89
Chancellor (1)	$136,248	$141,942	4.2%
Executive Vice Chancellor (1)	118,974	123,948	4.2
Vice Chancellors (4)	117,294	122,196	4.2
General Counsel (1)	117,294	122,196	4.2
Deputy Vice Chancellor (1)	95,700	101,448	6.0
Assistant Vice Chancellors (9)	87,730	94,300	7.5
Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	99,672	Vacant	N/A
University Auditor (1)	77,004	83,412	8.3
Associate General Counsel (1)	91,284	96,744	6.0

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

Presidents, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Vice Chancellors) in comparison to the total compensation paid to comparable administrators at comparable public and private universities. In a process similar to that used to develop a salary comparison group for faculty salaries, the CPEC shall consult with UC, CSU, the Legislative Analyst, and the Department of Finance in determining comparison universities for this top-level salary comparison. This report shall include a discussion of policies concerning outside income.

For the first year of this report, CPEC shall also report on the job responsibilities of the top-level systemwide administrators within UC and CSU in comparison to the job responsibilities of UC and CSU campus presidents/chancellors. (CPEC's current administrator report requirement includes campus chancellor/president salary levels in comparison to other comparable universities.)

2. *Description of the Process Used by Other States in Setting Top-Level Administrator Salaries*

   The CPEC shall report in its next administrator salary report on the process used to determine top-level administrator (President/Chancellor, Senior Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Vice Chancellors) and campus Chancellor/President compensation by other states with institutions comparable to UC and CSU.

As part of next year's report, the Commission will thus review and comment on data collected from throughout the country in order to help the Legislature better understand the various mechanisms used by other systems and campuses in the setting of executive compensation. However, as with its companion report on faculty salaries, the Commission will not "recommend" a level or amount appropriate for executive compensation.

Appendix

August 9, 1979

Gerald Hayward
Director of Legislative and Public Affairs
California Community Colleges
1238 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jerry:

As you know, the Legislature took several actions during the current session concerning the reporting of salary data. The first of these emanated from the Legislative Analyst's report and requires the Commission to include the Community Colleges in our annual reports on University of California and California State University and Colleges faculty salaries. The second action appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of collecting salary data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years. The latter action, however, did not specify the type of information to be collected.

It is my understanding that you discussed this subject with Bill Storey and agreed that we should develop a detailed list of the information we will require for our report. After that, I presume you will contact us if there are any questions or ambiguities.

Our questions fall into three categories: (1) full-time faculty, (2) part-time faculty, and (3) administrators. For each of these, we will need the following:

Full-time faculty

1. A listing of all salary classifications (e.g. BA + 30, MA, etc.) for each Community College District.
2. The actual salary at each step of each classification.
3. The number of faculty at each step of each classification.
4. The amounts of any bonuses that are granted to faculty, the number of faculty receiving them, the total salary of every faculty member receiving a bonus, and the reason for granting the bonus.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.
6. The total number of full-time faculty in each district.
7. The mean salary received by those full-time faculty.
8. The total dollar amount paid to full-time faculty as a group.

Part-time faculty

1. The total number of part-time faculty employed by each district on both a headcount and full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.
2. The mean salary paid to each headcount faculty member in each district.
3. The mean salary paid to each FTE faculty member in each district.

4. The total dollar amount paid to all part-time faculty in each district.
5. A summary of the compensation plan for part-time faculty members in each district.

Administrators

1. A list of all administrative positions (titles) in each district.
2. The salary schedule for each position.
3. The number of headcount and FTE employees occupying each administrative position.
4. The actual salary paid to each employee in each administrative position.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.

A few words of explanation may be in order. The data requested for full-time faculty are very similar to those that have been collected by the Chancellor's Office for a number of years but which were not collected for 1978-79 due to Proposition 13 reductions. The only major difference relates to the detail on bonuses that was not clearly presented in prior reports.

We are asking for data on part-time faculty because of objections raised by Community College representatives. At the time our preliminary report on Community College salaries was presented, many Community College representatives, including those from the Chancellor's Office, complained that the data were misleading because part-time faculty were not included. To avoid that difficulty in the future, it is imperative that data on these faculty be included in next year's report to the Legislature.

We are also asking for data on administrators because of the concerns expressed by both the Legislature (on the subject of academic administration generally) and various Community College faculty organizations. I am not sure we will publish any of the data on administrators but we do want to be able to respond to questions should they arise.

The final item concerns the dates for receipt of the data. As you know, we publish two salary reports each year. Since the University and the State University report to us each year by November 1, we think it would be appropriate to set November 1 as a reporting date (for the 1978-79 data) for the Chancellor's Office as well. For the 1979-80 data, we would like to have a report by March 1 so that we may include it in our final report to the Legislature. In future years, the March 1 date should become permanent.

If you have any questions concerning any of these matters, please let me know

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. O'Brien, Jr.
Associate Director

KBOB:mc

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs.* Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 87-36. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 88-9. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 88-30. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: The Commission' 1988 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 89-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1989.

--. *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University.* Commission Report 89-22. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1989.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1988-89: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 89-26. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1989.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1990-91: The Commission's 1988 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 90-10. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1990.

--. Propectus for a Study of Part-Time Faculty in California Public Postsecondary Education. Commission Agenda Item 6, March 5, 1990. Sacramento. The Commission.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. *Study of Part-Time Instruction.* Sacramento: Research Analysis Unit, Chancellor's Office, January 1987.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of February 1990, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach;
Henry Der, San Francisco;
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco;
Rosalind K. Goddard, Los Angeles;
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach;
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Vice Chair;*
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles; *Chair;* and
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto.

Representatives of the segments are:

Meredith J. Khachigian, San Clemente; appointed by the Regents of the University of California;

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University;

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions;

Joseph D. Carrabino, Orange; appointed by the California State Board of Education; and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, its meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1989-90

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 90-21

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

90-1 Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century (January 1990)

90-2 Technical Background Papers to *Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century* (January 1990)

90-3 A Capacity for Learning: Revising Space and Utilization Standards for California Public Higher Education (January 1990)

90-4 Survey of Space and Utilization Standards and Guidelines in the Fifty States: A Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-5 Calculation of Base Factors for Comparison Institutions and Study Survey Instruments: Technical Appendix to *Survey of Space and Utilization Standards and Guidelines in the Fifty States*. A Second Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-6 Final Report, Study of Higher Education Space and Utilization Standards/Guidelines in California: A Third Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-7 Legislative Priorities of the Commission, 1990: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-8 State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1990: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-9 Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers: A Revision of the Commission's 1982 *Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers* (January 1990)

90-10 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1990-91: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1990)

90-11 Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1990: The Third in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (March 1990)

90-12 The Dynamics of Postsecondary Expansion in the 1990s: Report of the Executive Director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, March 5, 1990 (March 1990)

90-13 Analysis of the 1990-91 Governor's Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1990)

90-14 Comments on the California Community Colleges' 1989 Study of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Second Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language to the 1988 State Budget Act (April 1990)

90-15 Services for Students with Disabilities in California Public Higher Education, 1990: The First in a Series of Biennial Reports to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 746 (Chapter 829, Statutes of 1987) (April 1990)

90-16 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1989: The First in a Series of Biennial Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1416 (Chapter 446, Statutes of 1989) (April 1990)

90-17 Academic Program Evaluation in California, 1988-89: The Commission's Fourteenth Annual Report on Program Planning, Approval, and Review Activities. (June 1990)

90-18 Expanding Information and Outreach Efforts to Increase College Preparation: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 133 (Chapter 72, Statutes of 1988) (June 1990)

90-19 Toward an Understanding of Campus Climate: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 4071 (Chapter 690, Statutes of 1988) (June 1990)

90-20 Planning for a New Faculty: Issues for the Twenty-First Century. California's Projected Supply of New Graduate Students in Light of Its Need for New Faculty Members. (September 1990)

90-21 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1989-90: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation. (September 1990)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE